

May 7, 1987

LB 130, 218, 288A, 288, 768, 769, 785  
786

Mr. President, your Committee on Enrollment and Review reports LB 218 to Select File, 768, 769, 130, 785, and 786. That is all that I have, Mr. President. (See pages 2075-76 of the Journal.)

SPEAKER BARRETT: Although it is not on the agenda, it was my intent to go to an A bill for 288 also. At this time I would like to recognize Senator Pappas.

SENATOR PAPPAS: Mr. Speaker, colleagues, I would move to indefinitely postpone LB 288A also, seeing it is on General File and it serves no purpose for any type of bill substitution because of its low position. So I think we should do the right thing to clear the board of both 288 and 288A.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. You heard the motion to indefinitely postpone the A bill, any discussion? I have several lights on. Senator Withem, would you care to discuss it? Senator Hall, please.

SENATOR HALL: Mr. President and members, I question whether or not it makes good sense to kill the A bill. I don't have any problem with the body's decision to kill 288 and I probably should have politically voted for that because the people in my district who wrote me are not going to understand why I voted the way I did, because I could support the bill, it would have been easy for me in either case to support the bill or lay off of it once the amendment that Senator Labeledz and I offered was adopted. The reason I suggest that we not kill this bill is that the provisions in 288, the technical changes, only those that would save the state some money and not have any effect on the counties makes good sense. Those provisions such as the annual application, the provision such as the fact that one would not receive the homestead exemption if their birth date did not fall on or before January 1 of the year in which they turn 65. Those provisions are provisions that I would like put into an A bill that I have on Final Reading that we did not need for the hearing impaired individuals with regard to interpreters. I would like to put that into that bill, keep 288A alive just so we could facilitate those changes and not do anything with regard to, would strike all the language that was in...that was basically the reason for the kill motion on LB 288 and be able to have the system operate in a way that I think it should be, the state would pay a 100 percent of it. I have no problem with that. But I think in order to be able to do that I do need the A bill for 288A and I would use the A bill that I